



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS. By PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY. *The Expositor*, 1897, pp. 274-286; 425-435.

The chief aim of this paper is to show "that the principle of a general census was contemplated by Augustus," and that in Luke 2:1-3 is preserved the memory of this principle by the mention of one fact in the application of it to a particular province. Evidence renders it probable that Luke is right in the following points: (1) A series of *census* were taken in Syria and Egypt; (2) the idea of taking these *census* originated with Augustus; (3) the first census was taken 9-8 B. C. Accordingly, when Luke speaks of "a first enrollment" he refers to the *first* census of this series and not to the earlier of two *census* held by Quirinius. How account, then, for the fact that the first census in Syria was under Saturninus, while the same census is referred by Luke to Quirinius? Accepting the hypothesis that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria, his first term must be not later than 5-3 B. C. Since, however, Varus administered Syria 6-3 B. C., Quirinius must have been associated with Varus, the former administering the armies and conducting the Homonadensian war, the latter as civil administrator and thus having charge of the census. Luke's statement that the census was under Quirinius is simply to give for it a more definite date than a mention of Varus would. But the first census should be taken in 9-8 B. C., and that mentioned by Luke as first was held not earlier than 6 B. C. and was in progress in 4 B. C. This discrepancy may be removed if we consider Luke to speak of the census under Quirinius (for some reason delayed till that late date) as the application of the first census period to Palestine. Accordingly, Luke 2:1, 2 should be understood thus: "There was issued a decree by Cæsar Augustus that census should be taken of the entire Roman world; this [with which we are concerned] took place, the first census [of the series], while Quirinius was administering the province of Syria."

This historical interpretation of Luke's language is hardly warranted by the evidence. For Tertullian, upon whose accuracy Professor Ramsay relies to prove the occurrence in Syria of the first census of the series, states that it *was held* (evidently

completed) in Judea 9-8 B. C. Thus Quirinius' census, occurring at least three years later, cannot be said to be the application of that *first census period* to Palestine, since that application has been made. If both Tertullian and Luke are right we have two *census*. If Tertullian is wrong the evidence for a first census is wanting. In either case the institution of an indictional period is not proved. We admit with Professor Ramsay "that whatever view is adopted difficulties and unanswerable questions remain."

HENRY TODD DE WOLFE.

FOXBORO, Mass.

RECENT ARTICLES ON THE LOGIA. *The Independent*, July 14-Sept. 9: *Expository Times*, September.

Recent numbers of *The Independent* have given its readers numerous articles on "The New Sayings of Jesus." Following is, in brief, a summary of the discussion:

The issue for July 15 published a cabled translation, which had first appeared in the *Sun* and the *Journal* of New York. The next issue gave the text "hastily and in part conjecturally," the corrected text of the seven so-called "logia" appearing two weeks later. Accompanying the text, as cabled, was a dispatch from Professor J. Rendel Harris, of Cambridge, stating as his opinion that the "new logia" are "probably early sayings of Christ," the Greek text being "apparently from a Semitic origin." "It affords proof that many things in Luke," differing from Matthew and Mark, and hitherto regarded as variations, "will turn out to be original." The accompanying editorial comments upon logia 2 and 5 as unlike anything in the New Testament.

The same issue (July 22) contains a three-column discussion by Professor Bacon, of Yale, who thinks that the Roman character of the uncial script indicates a date not later than 200 A. D., though the entire third century lies within the possibilities; further, the usual abbreviations of biblical MSS. present, and the book-form, make a date earlier than 150 A. D. extremely improbable. But in the second part of the second century the canonical gospels "had a world-wide currency and a supremacy practically unchallenged." The time is near when "the Syrian church is translating its fourfold gospel," and Tatian his *Diatessaron*. Professor Bacon evidently thinks it unlikely that at such a time any scribe would have thought it desirable to make separate preservation of these logia of Jesus, of which at least four are parallelisms, wholly or in part, to sayings reported by Matthew. Granting the scribe's possible ignorance of the canonical gospels, there are only three possibilities for the derivation of the material:

1. "It was invented in the interest of some heretical doctrine or

doctrines." But the fragment cannot be classed with any gnostic or other heretical writings.

2. "It is an adaptation of material taken from the canonical gospels to the wants of the unorthodox." But there is the total lack of the ever-present mark of all such productions, viz., "the doctrinal animus." This group of logia, as a group, is absolutely miscellaneous and colorless.

3. The writer was one who was interested to preserve the logia of the Lord.

"The internal characteristics of the logia are sufficient to guarantee the purity and antiquity of their derivation." They are, moreover, independent of our gospels. Their source must go back to the time when the primitive compilation of logia mentioned by Papias was yet current.

After the synoptics became current, mere compilations of logia could survive only through the later interest of the antiquarian, and to such in all probability is due "the present survival."

As regards logion 3, in answer to the possible charge that it is borrowed from apocryphal sources, "the priority is at least as likely to be on the side of our logion as on the other side." In reply to the charge that logion 2 is "at variance with the accepted teachings of Christ," a Jewish forgery in support of the Jewish Sabbath, Professor Bacon allows only a spiritual significance for this, and so finds it "in the line of Is. 58 and perfectly in the spirit of Jesus." Stating that the first part of logion 5 is admittedly parallel to Matt. 18:20, and thus dealing with the organization for worship and government of the Christian congregation, as successors of the synagogue, and observing that parallelism and antithesis prevail elsewhere in the logia, he thinks it possible to interpret the latter part of 5 as pertaining to the same. The stone signifies the altar. The wood is for sacrifice. Professor Bacon means this to be interpreted as figurative. He opposes this to the pantheistic exegesis already suggested by others.

Professor Harris' cable dispatch is followed by "Some Notes on the Logia," which appeared July 29. In this he submits that this accretion betrays the fact that a large part of the teaching of Jesus must have passed into oblivion. The influence, moreover, of this document will be felt in various directions. (1) There will be a revival of interest in oriental, and especially Egyptian, research. (2) Another direction of influence will be "in the study of the origins and the text of the New Testament." It shows that primitive collections of the sayings of

Christ underlie the existing gospels, "reaching beyond the units of the existing gospels." Papias' reference to the original logia of Christ, written by Matthew in the Hebrew dialect, has been taken as proof of the currency of the gospel of Matthew in the beginning of the second century. The discovery of this fragment shows that Papias' reference must not necessarily favor the antiquity of the canonical gospel of Matthew. He may have been speaking of a collection of sayings. In the same way the writing attributed by Papias to Mark may vary from our canonical gospel of Mark. A fresh analysis and a readjustment of the evidence may be necessary, if our canonical Matthew is to be placed far back in the first century. (3) "There will be a change of the critical attitude in matters relating to the text of the existing gospels," and the theories as to the cause of variations in these gospels. The seventh logion Professor Harris regards as unquestionably on the side of Resch, whose theory is that there are traces of the primitive Hebrew gospel to be detected, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Fathers—the theory positing many variants which are due to no known documentary source. (4) The discussion of the synoptic problem will be affected by the discovery. Luke has been regarded as depending upon Matthew, or as having made editorial expansions and corrections which do not proceed from the sources of the synoptic tradition. Probably the measure of the editorial skill credited to Luke will have to be reduced.

The issue for August 5 contains a facsimile of the fragment, with brief mention of H. C. Leonard's article in *The Guardian* (London), who thinks this may have been one of Tatian's lost works, or "a separate collection made by him in the course of the studies which resulted in the *Diatessaron*."

Professor J. H. Thayer suggests, in the number for August 12, that to conclude from this fragment that Matthew's logia in Hebrew were merely a string of disconnected fragments would be hasty.

In "Biblical Research," in the issue for August 19, the writer regards the internal evidence such that these logia cannot be placed later than 140 A. D.; that they could not have formed a part of a narrative gospel; that a more satisfactory view, though not without difficulties, "is that the fragment is what it professes to be, a collection of some of our Lord's sayings," and that, estimated from their archaic tone and framework, they were put in their present form not later than the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. Though the fragment does not at all amount to a demonstration, "it strongly

supports the view that, in speaking of logia, Papias and Eusebius intended some similar collection." This theory is sustained by a comparison of the fragment with our gospel, where there are discovered points of contact with Matthew and Mark, but divergences of reading, and also new logia, while indeed there is no perfectly clear case of verbal agreement; the only coincidence at all striking is in the use of *δεκτός*. Logion 6, like Luke in the similar saying, and different from the other three gospels. The hypothesis that both Luke and this fragment come from a common source is as likely as any. There is not a vestige of the peculiar tenets of developed gnosticism, while the ring of genuineness of these logia and the primitive cast of all seven of them favor the independence of the fragment from our gospels.

Dr. McGiffert, in the issue for August 26, objects to Dr. Bacon's suggested interpretation of logion 5. Making the first part convey the idea that "where any are together and even one is a believer, there Jesus is with him," it then corresponds with an interpretation of the second part, which makes the mention of raising the stone and clearing the wood a reference to labor. Then the meaning is that even in the midst of the world, and in the common occupations of life, the believer may expect Christ's presence.

The issue for September 2 gives Professor Harnack's conclusion that the new logia are from "the gospel according to the Egyptians," and adds points from a recent lecture by Mr. Grenfell, one of the editors of the fragment. Mr. Grenfell controverts the theory of Professor Harnack. He regards the fragment a leaf from a book of great importance, not an original MS., but a copy. Logion 2 he thinks metaphorical, and so perfectly consistent with the teaching of the gospels. Logion 5 is not pantheistic, but addressed to the pessimistic mind which regarded toil and labor as drudgery and sorrow; extracts cited from *The Gospel according to the Egyptians* show that these logia are modeled on wholly different lines. Added points in a lecture by Professor Harris are these: (1) Nearly all these logia show traces of Hebraism, either in the speech or in the parallelism of the parts of the sayings; (2) the whole of logia 5 was known to Clement of Alexandria, who commented upon it at least three times, and always mystically.

The issue of September 9 gives selections from Professor Harnack's translation of the logia. Besides numerous verbal differences from the rendering given by English scholars, there is a new arrangement. Logion 4 is made a part of 3, and for a 7th he has "Jesus saith, Thou

hearest (or hear!) . . . ,” which has not before appeared. Some of Professor Harnack’s comments, not found elsewhere, are as follows: Logion 4 probably refers to the disciples. The fasting of logion 2 is evidently ascetic, in accord with Luke 14:33. The observing of the Sabbath means the sanctification of the whole life. This logion is probably not from Jesus. So the first part of 3 and all of 5. The second half of 3 might come naturally from the lips of Jesus; likewise the thought of 4, if not the form.

Professor C. Clemen interprets logion 2 as legalistic. He regards the whole fragment as of subordinate value for the literary criticism of the gospels.

The September number of the *Expository Times* contains a valuable article by Professor Swete. In common with other writers, he regards the title given the fragments, “Sayings of Jesus,” eminently appropriate. Logion 2, interpreted metaphorically, is a most natural answer to a query of the disciples regarding fasts and the Sabbath. Whether logion 3 is a genuine saying of Jesus or the product of early meditation upon his true sayings it is impossible to tell. Placed, however, among the utterances of Holy Week, it would be quite natural. Professor Swete agrees with Professor Harnack in the division of the logia, and suggests, for 7, “Jesus saith, Thou hearest in one of thine ears, but the other thou hast closed.”

This article of Professor Swete is as scholarly as any that has yet appeared in English, and his translation, with provisional readings, the most interesting.

E. D. V.